

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the present application in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the following remarks. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 2, 3, 11, 15, 17-34, and 36-42 were previously canceled and Claim 7 is canceled herein without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein.
- Claims 1, 8, 16, and 35 are amended herein.
- Therefore, Claims 1, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16, 35, and 43-46 are currently pending for consideration.

Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 8, 16, and 35 is found in the specification, as originally filed, in at least paragraphs [0023] – [0025]. No new matter is being incorporated thereby.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicant hereby cancels dependent Claim 7. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Cited Documents

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the present Application:

- **Satomi:** Satomi, Mitsunori; et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0148327
- **John:** John, Ranjit; et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0088412
- **Alao:** Alao, Rachad; et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147645

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16, 35, and 43-46 are Non-Obvious over Satomi in view of John and Alao

Claims 1, 4-10, 12-14, 16, 35 and 43-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Satomi in view of John and Alao. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and further requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. Applicant respectfully notes that Claim 7 is hereby canceled, thus obviating the rejection with respect to Claim 7. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicant hereby amends independent Claims 1, 8, 16, and 35 in the manner set forth above.

Independent Claim 1

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Satomi, John, and Alao neither teaches nor suggests at least the following features recited in independent Claim 1:

utilizing the log entries to generate a second report different from the exception report describing viewer usage patterns and viewer shopping patterns, the viewer usage patterns including information relating to which programs a viewer watches, a frequency in which the viewer tunes in to watch programs, and a frequency in which the viewer changes channels, and the viewer shopping patterns including information relating to a frequency in which the viewer uses a home shopping application, a number of viewers who opened a catalog of a particular merchant, which items in the catalog attracted the most attention, and whether the viewers browsed the catalog multiple times.

Applicant respectfully notes that independent Claim 1 is hereby amended to recite the above features. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Satomi, John, and Alao is silent with respect to the foregoing recitations.

For instance, Satomi describes “a system for collecting pieces of information needed for an administrator from pieces of log information retained by two or more kinds of and a plurality of servers that constitute a complicated system such as a Web system” (paragraph [0011]). Moreover, Alao describes “a method and apparatus for managing the presentation and regulation of E-commerce, content and service providers access in an interactive television environment comprising interactions between a server, a client, and a service provider” (Abstract). John describes that a “Cluster Management Console” receives reports regarding “[c]ritical errors, warning, asynchronous event notifications (hot object transfer completion, for example)”

(paragraph [0097]). John further describes that “[a]n administrator using the Console is accordingly informed about such events on any server in a cluster and if needed can then take appropriate action” (paragraph [0097]).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that such reports received by the “Cluster Management Console” described in John do not relate to “viewer usage patterns and viewer shopping patterns,” as presently recited in independent Claim 1. Further, Applicant submits that the foregoing combination of references also does not teach or suggest a report that includes “information relating to which programs a viewer watches, a frequency in which the viewer tunes in to watch programs, and a frequency in which the viewer changes channels,” and, “information relating to a frequency in which the viewer uses a home shopping application, a number of viewers who opened a catalog of a particular merchant, which items in the catalog attracted the most attention, and whether the viewers browsed the catalog multiple times,” as presently recited in independent Claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Satomi, John, and Alao, both singularly and in combination.

Independent Claims 8, 16, and 35

The combination of Satomi, John, and Alao fails to teach or suggest each element of independent Claims 8, 16, and 35 for at least the reasoning presented above with respect to independent Claim 1 to the extent that Claims 1, 8, 16, and 35 recite similar subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent

Claims 8, 16, and 35 are also patentable over Satomi, John, and Alao, both singularly and in combination, for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 4-6, 9, 10, 12-14, and 43-46

As stated above, independent Claims 1, 8, 16, and 35 are patentable over the combination of Satomi, John, and Alao. Accordingly, dependent Claims 4-6, 9, 10, 12-14, and 43-46 are also patentable over the above combination of references at least by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 8, 16, and 35, as well as for the additional features that Claims 4-6, 9, 10, 12-14, and 43-46 recite.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16, 35, and 43-46 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and issuance of a notice of allowance. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Brett J. Schlameus/

Dated: 10/7/2010

Brett J. Schlameus
(brett@leehayes.com; 206-876-6022)
Registration No. 60827

Kayla D. Brant
(kayla@leehayes.com; 509-944-4742)
Registration No. 46576